

Application No. 10/035,817  
Amendment dated 07/06/2006  
Reply to Office action of 04/07/2006

Page 11 of 18

**Remarks**

Claims 1-38 are pending in the application. Claims 1-38 were rejected. Claims 1 and 26 are the independent claims. Reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The examiner rejected claims 1-38 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Glass, in view of Sudia.

Independent claim 1 recites a method of personalizing an electronic signature device to a user. The electronic signature device includes a processor, a memory, a user input device including a first signature input device, and a device interface, all communicatively connected by at least one bus. According to the claimed method, a digitized written user signature of the user is received via the first signature input device. A prime parameter, a sub-prime parameter, and a base parameter are generated. A signing private key is generated. A signing public key is generated based on the prime, sub-prime, and base parameters. A user public key is generated based on the signing private key and the prime and base parameters. A biometric electronic template is generated based on the digitized written user signature. The prime, sub-prime, and base parameters, the signing private and public keys, and the biometric electronic template are stored in the memory.

In contrast, Glass discloses a method and apparatus for applying and verifying a biometric-based digital signature to an electronic document. According to the Glass method, an electronic document is "signed" using a hash value and a biometric value. First, a token value is added to the electronic document, and the hash function is applied

Application No. 10/035,817  
Amendment dated 07/06/2006  
Reply to Office action of 04/07/2006

Page 12 of 18

to the token-document combination to provide a hash value. See column 4, lines 27-39.

A biometric reading is performed to provide a biometric value and a digital signature based on the biometric value, a secret key (which can be the private key of an asymmetric key pair). See column 4, lines 50-65. Later, an authentication process is performed.

Thus, Glass generates an electronic signature related to an electronic document, used by a recipient of the document to verify that the sender of the document is correctly identified, and that the document has not been tampered with during transmission. See column 6, lines 42-60. Glass does not disclose receiving a digitized written user signature, as recited in claim 1. The examiner asserted that Glass discloses a user input device including a first signature input device and a device interface, and receiving a digitized written user signature of the user but it is respectfully submitted that this is not the case. Rather, the Glass signature is digital-only generated by the camera or other biometric value generator. See Fig. 1 and column 4, lines 57-65. The user signature recited in claim 1 is a written signature that has been digitized, and that is provided by the user via a signature input device. Glass does not disclose or suggest this aspect of the claimed method. In fact, Glass acknowledges that the disclosed system is only modeled on a system using an actual physical signature, and performs an analogous function on an electronic document using only electronic means. See column 1, lines 9-33.

Further, Glass does not disclose generation of a biometric electronic template based on a digitized written user signature, as recited in claim 1. As noted above, Glass does not disclose any written signature at all, only an electronic signature generated by the biometric apparatus. Glass does disclose the use of biometrics, specifically the

Application No. 10/035,817  
Amendment dated 07/06/2006  
Reply to Office action of 04/07/2006

capture of biometric data of a user by way of an iris scan, which is hashed with a hash value derived from an operation on a token and the electronic document. See column 4, lines 30-35 and 60-65. As noted in this passage, Glass generates the digital signature based on a hash of the biometric data. In contrast, claim 1 recites generation of a biometric electronic template based on a digitized written user signature. Clearly, this is different than the Glass process, and Glass does not disclose or suggest generation of a biometric electronic template based on a digitized written user signature.

The examiner acknowledged that Glass does not disclose generation of prime, sub-prime, and base parameters on which a public key is based, as recited in claim 1, and stated that Sudia discloses generation of these parameters, at column 13, lines 18-33, as well as generation of asymmetric key pairs for encryption. Sudia does disclose the generation and use of asymmetric key pairs for encryption (see column 2, lines 18-29), but does not disclose or suggest generation of prime, sub-prime, and base parameters on which a public key is based. In the passage cited by the examiner, Sudia discusses the creation of restrictions to be used as authorization attributes of signed document. See column 12, line 45 through column 13, line 17 for background related to the cited passage. The attributes used to create the restrictions limit access to the signed document, but are not used to generate a public key, and are not the prime, sub-prime, and base parameters recited in claim 1.

Also, Sudia does not overcome the deficiencies of the Glass reference noted earlier. That is, Sudia does not disclose or suggest a user input device including a first signature input device and a device interface, receiving a digitized written user signature,

Application No. 10/035,817  
Amendment dated 07/06/2006  
Reply to Office action of 04/07/2006

Page 14 of 18

or generation of a biometric electronic template based on a digitized written user signature, all as recited in claim 1. In fact, Sudia teaches against or at least distinguishes the use of a physical written signature in such a system, at column 1, lines 37-46. Because neither reference discloses or suggests any of these claimed features, not combination of the cited references could render obvious the invention recited in claim 1.

Thus, Glass discloses a method and apparatus that are fundamentally different than the claimed method. Glass discloses a system that electronically identifies a user with a document, generating an electronic "signature" based on the user's biometric input and other electronic values. The claimed invention, on the other hand, is a method of personalizing an electronic signature device to a user, utilizing the user's actual written signature in digitized form to produce a biometric template stored in memory in the signature device, for future use by the user in, for example, binding the user's signature to a document. Sudia discloses use of asymmetric key pairs for encryption, but does not otherwise disclose or suggest elements of the claimed invention.

For at least the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that the invention recited in claim 1 is not obvious in view of the teachings of Glass and Sudia. Claims 2-25 depend from claim 1, and therefore also are not obvious in view of these references. The rejection of claims 1-25, therefore, should be withdrawn.

Independent claim 26 recites a method of originating an electronically signed transaction. An electronic signature device includes a processor, a memory having a biometric electronic template, a prime parameter, a sub-prime parameter, and a base parameter, user public data comprising a user public key, and a user private key stored

Application No. 10/035,817  
Amendment dated 07/06/2006  
Reply to Office action of 04/07/2006

therein, a user interface comprising a signature input device, a device interface adapted to interface a computer, and at least one bus operably connected to the processor, the memory, the user interface, and the device interface. According to the claimed method, verification takes place as to whether a user is permitted to originate the electronically signed transaction with the electronic signature device. This verification includes receiving a digitized written originator signature via the user interface, and comparing the digitized written originator signature against the biometric electronic template to produce a first verification result. A transaction package is received through either the user interface or the device interface. The transaction package and either the digitized originator signature or a digitized user signature extracted from the biometric electronic template are combined to produce an originator signature block. An ephemeral private key is generated based on the prime, sub-prime, and base parameters. An ephemeral public key is generated based on the ephemeral private key and the prime and base parameters. A shared encryption key is generated based on the ephemeral public key, the user public key, and the prime parameter. The originator signature block is encrypted with the shared encryption key to produce an encrypted signature block. The encrypted signature block, the ephemeral private key, the prime parameter, and at least a portion of the user public data are combined to produce an electronically signed transaction. If the user is verified, the electronically signed transaction is provided via the device interface.

In contrast, Glass discloses a method and apparatus for applying and verifying a biometric-based digital signature to an electronic document. According to the Glass method, an electronic document is "signed" using a hash value and a biometric value.

Page 16 of 18

Application No. 10/035,817  
Amendment dated 07/06/2006  
Reply to Office action of 04/07/2006

First, a token value is added to the electronic document, and the hash function is applied to the token-document combination to provide a hash value. See column 4, lines 27-39. A biometric reading is performed to provide a biometric value and a digital signature based on the biometric value, a secret key (which can be the private key of an asymmetric key pair). See column 4, lines 50-65. Later, an authentication process is performed.

Thus, Glass generates an electronic signature related to an electronic document, used by a recipient of the document to verify that the sender of the document is correctly identified, and that the document has not been tampered with during transmission. See column 6, lines 42-60. Glass does not disclose receiving a digitized written originator signature, as recited in claim 26. The Glass signature is digital-only generated by the camera or other biometric value generator. The originator signature recited in claim 26 is a written signature that has been digitized, and that is provided by the originator via a signature input device.

Further, Glass does not disclose comparing the digitized written originator signature against a biometric electronic template, as recited in claim 26. As noted above, Glass does not disclose any written signature at all, only an electronic signature generated by the biometric apparatus.

The examiner acknowledged that Glass does not disclose generation of ephemeral private and public keys based on prime, sub-prime, and base parameters, as recited in claim 26, and stated that Sudia discloses generation of these parameters, at column 13, lines 18-33, as well as generation of asymmetric key pairs for encryption. Sudia does disclose the generation and use of asymmetric key pairs for encryption (see column 2,

Application No. 10/035,817  
Amendment dated 07/06/2006  
Reply to Office action of 04/07/2006

lines 18-29), but does not disclose or suggest generation of ephemeral private and public keys based on prime, sub-prime, and base parameters. In the passage cited by the examiner, Sudia discusses the creation of restrictions to be used as authorization attributes of signed document. See column 12, line 45 through column 13, line 17 for background related to the cited passage. The attributes used to create the restrictions limit access to the signed document, but are not used to generate a public key, and are not the prime, sub-prime, and base parameters recited in claim 26.

Also, Sudia does not overcome the deficiencies of the Glass reference noted earlier. That is, Sudia does not disclose or suggest a user interface including a signature input device and a device interface, receiving a digitized written originator signature, or a biometric electronic template, all as recited in claim 1. In fact, Sudia teaches against or at least distinguishes the use of a physical written signature in such a system, at column 1, lines 37-46. Because neither reference discloses or suggests any of these claimed features, not combination of the cited references could render obvious the invention recited in claim 1.

Thus, Glass discloses a method and apparatus that are fundamentally different than the claimed method. Glass discloses a system that electronically identifies a user with a document, generating an electronic "signature" based on the user's biometric input and other electronic values. The claimed invention, on the other hand, is a method of originating an electronically signed transaction, utilizing the user's actual written signature in digitized form to verify permission to originate the transaction by comparing the signature against a biometric template stored in memory in the signature device.

Application No. 10/035,817  
Amendment dated 07/06/2006  
Reply to Office action of 04/07/2006

Page 18 of 18

Sudia discloses use of asymmetric key pairs for encryption, but does not otherwise disclose or suggest elements of the claimed invention.

For at least the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that Glass does not anticipate the invention recited in claim 26. Claims 27-38 depend from claim 26, and therefore also cannot be anticipated by Glass. The rejection of claims 26-38, therefore, should be withdrawn.

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that all rejections have been overcome. It is therefore requested that the Amendment be entered, the claims allowed, and the case passed to issue. If any issues remain outstanding, the examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned agent to attempt resolution in a telephone interview.

Respectfully submitted,

July 6, 2006

Date

TMC:hlp



Thomas M. Champagne  
Registration No. 36,478  
Customer Number 49691  
(828) 253-8600